

2025:PHHC:050608



214.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-17638-2025**

Date of decision: 21.04.2025

ASI Jasvir Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior DAG, Punjab.

-----

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.8, dated 24.02.2025, under Sections 7, 7A of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, amended Act, 2018, and Section 61(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Patiala.

2. On the last date of hearing i.e. 01.04.2025, after noticing the contentions of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the investigating agency is relying upon a purported audio conversation between the complainant and the petitioner regarding the alleged demand of illegal gratification for not subjecting her son and husband to custodial torture in a case registered under Section 307 etc. of the IPC against them. Learned counsel submits that had there been any such audio recording of the petitioner, it would have been produced before

the learned Special Judge when he approached the said Court for the grant of anticipatory bail, however, no such audio recording was placed on record although it was referred to by the investigating agency.”

3. On being put to notice, learned State counsel has filed status report by way of affidavit dated 07.04.2025 of Satpal Sharma, PPS, Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Bureau, Unit, Sangrur, on behalf of respondent-State, in Court today, which is taken on record subject to all just exceptions. A copy thereof has been supplied to the counsel opposite.

4. The prayer by the petitioner for anticipatory bail is founded on the contention that the material being relied upon by the prosecution, particularly an alleged audio recording between the co-accused, Harpreet Singh and the petitioner, was never produced before the learned Special Judge when he filed an application for anticipatory bail, nor before this Court and, thus, the implication of the petitioner is false and fabricated. It is also contended that the petitioner had previously been exonerated during an internal inquiry conducted by the Vigilance Bureau.

5. Learned State counsel has, however, vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite by drawing the attention of this Court to the status report which has been filed today. It has been submitted by the learned State counsel that a perusal of the status report discloses serious and prima facie credible allegations implicating the petitioner (a police official) in a grave case of corruption, abuse of authority, and criminal conspiracy, in active connivance with co-accused, Harpreet Singh, who is stated to be a known associate of the petitioner and acted as an intermediary in soliciting bribe from the complainant. A prayer

has, therefore, been made for dismissal of the instant petition as the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessitated.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

7. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR and the facts, as disclosed in the status report, it stands revealed that FIR No.44, dated 24.06.2024 was registered under Sections 307, 324, 323, 148 and 149 of IPC against the complainant's husband and son. The petitioner, who was then posted as the Investigating Officer, is alleged to have exploited his official position to extract illegal gratification. The intermediary, Harpreet Singh, is stated to have initially demanded a sum of Rs.2,60,000/- on behalf of the petitioner and the SHO of Police Station Cheema, purportedly to shield the complainant's family members from custodial torture and any adverse action. The demand was allegedly negotiated and recorded during the whatsapp call made by co-accused, Harpreet Singh to the petitioner in hands-free mode in the presence of the complainant. This call, as well as subsequent audio and video recordings, are stated to have been submitted by the complainant to the Investigating Agency

8. The material placed on record indicates that on 02.07.2024, the co-accused, Harpreet Singh, collected Rs.2,10,000/- from the complainant and later handed over the amount to the petitioner. The complainant was also threatened and pressurized to pay the remaining amount. Allegedly when the complainant attempted to flee with her daughter to her parental home, she was forcibly brought back by the accused without being

accompanied by any female police personnel. Recordings of this incident were also produced before the Investigating Agency.

9. Significantly, in his statement, co-accused, Harpreet Singh, has not only admitted to acting as a conduit but has also confirmed the identity of the voices in the recordings as that of the petitioner and himself. These recordings form critical part of the investigation and substantiate, at least prima facie, the involvement of the petitioner in the alleged acts of corruption.

10. In the present case, the role therefore, attributed to the petitioner is of a very serious nature. The allegations are not based on vague assertions but are prima facie supported by specific instances, recorded electronic evidence etc. The petitioner, being a serving police officer, entrusted with the duty to uphold the law, is instead alleged to have abused his authority for personal gain. The allegations, if proved, go to the very root of public trust in law enforcement agencies and raise serious concerns about the misuse of police powers.

11. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is, therefore, essential for unearthing the full extent of the conspiracy. The possibility of the petitioner influencing the witnesses or tampering with the evidence, given his position and the nature of the offence, cannot be ruled out at this stage.

12. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

13. Present petition stands dismissed accordingly.
14. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

April 21, 2025  
sanjeev

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable:        | Yes/No |